

United States Patent and Trademark Office

^
~ \
2 \
-
•

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,938	01/26/2004	Mohammed A. Fathimulla	P02,0004 01 H0002270 DIV	9312
128 7	590 03/14/2006	03/14/2006 EXAMINER		
-	L INTERNATIONA	PHAM, LONG		
101 COLUMBIA ROAD P O BOX 2245			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245			2814	
			DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/764,938	FATHIMULLA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Long Pham	2814	

	Long Pham	2814	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 21 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in a	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	g date of the final rejecting FIRST REPLY WAS For and the appropriation of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final Office.	on. ILED WITHIN te extension fee ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	s of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 		I E below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mnliant Amendment (PTOL -324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		impliant Americinent (F 10L-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	it before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	of be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant,fai	Js to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attack	ied.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by See attached office action. 	at does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowed	nce bécause:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s).	
13.		Long Joham Primary Examiner	
		Art Onit: 2814	

Art Unit: 2814

Advisory Action

Page 2

Status of Amendment After Final

There are no amendments after final.

Status of the Rejections and Claims

See the final rejection dated 12/20/05.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 02/21/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See below.

In response to the applicant's arguments in the three full paragraphs on page 10 of the response dated 02/21/06, it is submitted Annamalai patent teaches using a polysilicon as handle layer or wafer (see col. 4, line 45) (note that the reference of layer or wafer are merely different labels or inherent or intended functions of the same structure). Furthere, it is submitted that the polysilicon handle layer or wafer of Annamalai would inherently have a resistivity and this resistivity would constitute a high resistivity because "high" is relative and not being limited to a certain value.

In response to the applicant's arguments in the paragraphs on pages 12 and 13 of the response dated 02/21/06, it is submitted that the arguments are not relevant since the arguments are based on the teachings of Annamalai that are not being relied on for in the rejection.

In response to the applicant's arguments in the paragraphs on page 14 of the response dated 02/21/06, it is submitted that Temple is being relied on only for the teaching of using a polysilicon handle wafer having a resisitivity of 10⁶ ohm-cm or greater to withstand mechanical shock. See the rejection.

In response to the applicant's arguments in the paragraphs on pages 15 to 20 of the response dated 02/21/06, see the above examiners' responses.

Application/Control Number: 10/764,938 Page 3

Art Unit: 2814

With respect to the applicant's arguments concerning claims 33 and 35 at bottom of page 20, it is submitted that how the silicon layer is processed or formed has not been given patentability weight since claimed invention is directed to a device.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Long Pham whose telephone number is 571-272-1714. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Frid, 10am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on 571-272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Long Pham
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2814